

### **REMARKS**

Corrections were made to two paragraphs in the specification that labeled part number 46 consistently throughout. There was also a correction made to the Brief Description of Fig. 1 that states the display is according to the prior art.

Claims 1, 4-6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill, Jr. (US 5,790,096), in view of Kubes et al. (US 6,035,180). Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill, Jr. (US 5,790,096), in view of Kubes et al. (US 6,035,180), as applied to claims 1 or 6 above, and further in view of Shimoda (US 5,944,829). Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill, Jr. (US 5,790,096), in view of Kubes et al. (US 6,035,180), as applied to claims 1 or 6 above, and further in view of Nelson et al. (US 6,311,282 B1). Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested for the following reasons.

Applicant's invention as described in the specification and claimed in independent claims 1 and 6 is directed to a color organic electroluminescent display of the type having color emitting elements with different light emitting efficiencies, that saves power by determining the color of the elements having the highest efficiency; converting a color digital image to be displayed on the display to a monochrome image; and displaying the monochrome image using the determined color elements.

Hill Jr. discloses a controller for controlling all kinds of displays, including electroluminescent displays, which admittedly may have color light emitting elements with different light emitting efficiencies, although Hill Jr. does not specifically say so. In a first mode the controller uses only the green portion of a video signal to drive the red, green and blue inputs of a color display to produce a monochrome image. Thus, in this mode, all of the color elements are driven (see Col 7, lines 16-20) by the same amount. No power is saved thereby. In a second mode, the controller converts a color image signal to a monochrome signal according to the weighting chart in Table 1. The monochrome signal is then used to drive a monochrome display having only one color of light emitting elements (see Col 7, lines 21-30). No power is saved thereby. Neither of these modes suggest

Applicant's invention, which is to save power by driving only the color elements having the highest efficiency with the monochrome image signal.

Thus, even if the electroluminescent display of Kubes et al. were to be driven as the Examiner suggests by the controller of Hill Jr., in either the first or second modes noted above, it would not result in Applicant's invention as disclosed and claimed since neither Hill Jr. nor Kubes et al. suggest driving only the highest efficiency color elements in a display. It is believed therefore that the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* argument for obviousness and Applicant is entitled to patentability of claims 1 and 6. The remainder of the claims depend from claim 1 or 6 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225. *A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,



---

Thomas H. Close  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 27,428

THC:cjm  
Telephone: (585) 722-2396  
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646